



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,950	09/09/2003	Ronald H. Bluestone	867-P-3	3522
<div>7590 Gregory J. Nelson NELSON & ROEDIGER 4500 N. 32nd Street Suite 110 Phoenix, AZ 85018</div>			<div>EXAMINER PATEL, RITA RAMESH</div>	
			<div>ART UNIT 1746</div>	<div>PAPER NUMBER</div>
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/27/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/658,950

Applicant(s)

BLUESTONE ET AL.

Examiner

Rita R. Patel

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Applicant's Arguments / Amendments

This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed on 11/6/06. Claims 1-12 are pending. Claims 1, 4, and 10 have been amended. Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are not persuasive.

Claims objections for claims 1, 4, and 10 have been overcome due to applicant's amendments to these claims filed 11/6/06.

In applicant's remarks it is contested that the sink in the Lee reference is not intended for use to wash automotive parts and thus it fails to read on applicant's invention; however, the intended use of a machine is not germane to the issue of the patentability of the claimed structure. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the claimed use then it meets the claim. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235, 238 (CCPA 1967); *In re Otto*, 136 USPA 459 (CPA 1963). The sink of Lee is wholly capable of washing automotive parts therein and therefore reads on applicant's claim language. Moreover, as provided in the prior Office Action, the motivations provided for combining the prior Wilson and Lee references: it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to teach such a portable sink feature in view of Wilson because a portable sink provides lightness, compactness and a maximization of practicality in use of a sink (Lee: col. 1, lines 44, 57-58); using such a sink in combination with a parts washer would achieve expectations of increased cleansing of contaminated parts, provide water/solution efficiency, attain better technology for

Art Unit: 1746

providing an environmentally-friendlier cleaning process, and optimize washing time. In addition, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to teach said sink feature of Lee to said parts cleaning machine of Wilson since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893); a sink and parts washer are commonly known in the art to achieve similar objectives in the field of endeavor for cleaning apparatuses.

Re applicant's argument that the Lee specification fails to relate to movement of the sink, but rather to sliding reciprocation of panels 4 and 5, applicant's arguments appear to fail to be commensurate in scope. It seems that applicant has shifted the "movement of the sink" to be limited to the sliding panels 4 and 5, when it has been taught in the prior Office Action that Lee teaches: a foldable kitchen sink supported upwardly by two pairs of legs and attached to a dishwasher bucket 10 which is detachably seated on a middle section of the first member 1, and hinge connections 3 serve to fold the sink about said center hinges (col. 3, lines 40-45). This reads on applicant's claim language in independent claim 1 part (g) wherein a sink is mounted on a cabinet open top overlying an aid jet cleaning section having a closed position closing said cabinet open top and an open position providing access to said jet cleaning. Evidence by applicant must be reasonably commensurate in scope with the claimed invention. See, e.g., *In re Kulling*, 897 F.2d 1147, 1149, 14 USPQ2d 1056, 1058 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *In re*

Art Unit: 1746

Grasselli, 713 F.2d 731, 743, 218 USPQ 769, 777 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Applicant's argument's are not commensurate in scope and thus, are not persuasive.

Thus, claims 1-12 are finally rejected for the reasons of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 11 recites the limitation "circuit" in line 1 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purposes of examination, it will be presumed that claim 11 is dependent on claim 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 8 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson (US Patent No. 5,368,053) and further in view of Lee (US Patent No. 5,349,708).

Wilson teaches a parts cleaning machine 10 which includes a reservoir 12 and two tanks 14, 16. Wash solution is contained in tank 14 while rinse solution is contained

Art Unit: 1746

in tank 16. Wash solution enters the reservoir 12 through spray nozzles such as indicated at 68 in Figure 2. It is at once envisaged that the sink of Lee is outfitted with a faucet; a faucet reads on applicant's claims for a hand washer having a fluid supply hose communicating with a source of fluid pressure for manual cleaning parts. Pumps 18, 20 are used to transfer the washing solution from the tanks into the reservoir.

Although Wilson does not disclose the specific type of pump used in said invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a vane pump because vane pumps are commonly used in the art for hydraulic flow, also, vane pumps are cheap, simple and reliable ("rotary vane pump". Wikipedia (2006). Retrieved 17 July 2006, from wikipedia.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rotary_vane_pump). Ball valves 24, 26 and check valves 28, 30 control the transfer of wash solution and rinse solution from the tanks 14, 16 into the reservoir, which reads on applicant's claim for manual means having a supply hose communicating with a source of fluid pressure for manual cleaning. Said apparatus may also include heaters 36, 38 connectively attached to the tanks 14, 16; one would at once envisage appropriate circuitry connected to said heaters in such an electrically powered apparatus. Motor 52 is used to drive the basket 46 within the apparatus (col. 2, lines 6-9, 13-17, 31, 45-47). Spray nozzles 68 and tank 14 read on applicant's claim for an upper jet cleaning section and a lower fluid reservoir.

Wilson discloses the claimed invention, except fails to teach a sink attached thereon. However, Lee teaches a foldable kitchen sink supported upwardly by two pairs of legs and attached to a dishwater bucket 10 which is detachably seated on a middle

Art Unit: 1746

section of the first member 1. As seen in Figure 1 of Lee, the sink is generally rectangular, having sidewalls which terminate at an upwardly flared flange. Hinge connections 3 serve to fold the sink about said center hinges (col. 3, lines 40-45); thus reading on applicant's claim for a sink positionable on a cabinet having a closed position and open position. Rotatable mounting is achievable by Lee due to hinge connections 3 which serve to fold the sink about the center hinges. Moreover, the sink may be guided horizontally along a pair of guide rails 1b on the linear surface of the apparatus (col. 4, lines 43-45). Drain port 11 reads on applicant's claim for a drain means in said sink for communicating with said reservoir. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to teach such a portable sink feature in view of Wilson because a portable sink provides lightness, compactness and a maximization of practicality in use of a sink (Lee: col. 1, lines 44, 57-58); using such a sink in combination with a parts washer would achieve expectations of increased cleansing of contaminated parts, provide water/solution efficiency, attain better technology for providing an environmentally-friendlier cleaning process, and optimize washing time. In addition, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to teach said sink feature of Lee to said parts cleaning machine of Wilson since it has been held that forming in one piece an article which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893); a sink and parts washer are commonly known in the art to achieve similar objectives in the field of endeavor for cleaning apparatuses. With the Wilson invention in combination with the Lee invention, the parts

Art Unit: 1746

washer of Wilson would at once be envisaged to be located immediately below the sink of Lee, thus reading on applicant's claims wherein a sink is mounted on a cabinet overlying the aid jet cleaning section of the parts washer. When the sink of Lee is in an "open" position the sink is pulled upwards along hinge mechanism 3 and provides access to the cleaning section below; conversely, when the sink is in a "closed" position it closes the open top space formed between the sink/cabinet and the parts washer therebelow.

In combination of Wilson further in view of Lee, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to achieve safety measures by providing within the motor, as taught by Wilson, a safety interlock for permitting operation of the motor only when the sink is in a closed position. Also, by featuring a safety interlock in Wilson-Lee, spillage of liquid/solution may be avoided.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson and Lee as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Magliocca (US Patent No. 6,306,221).

Wilson and Lee fail to teach a brush for use within said cleaning apparatus, however, Magliocca teaches a hose with a flow-through brush 120 in a portable parts washing apparatus; both the nozzle 118, and the hose and brush 120 combination are commonly used on parts washer and are known by those knowledgeable in the art (col. 8, lines 64-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine said feature of Magliocca to Wilson-Lee because brushes

Art Unit: 1746

are known to be used in parts cleaning apparatuses to attain increased cleaning by expediting the break-up of encrusted waters thereupon.

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson and Lee as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, and further in view of Savkar (US Patent No. 5,528,913).

Wilson and Lee fail to teach a dampening closer, such as a gas spring, that extends between the sink and cabinet of the parts washing apparatus. However, Savkar teaches a washing machine with a plurality of snubbers may be used for self-balancing/dampening means. One end of each snubber is attached the washing machine housing and other end may be attached to the tub. The snubber sidewall defines an orifice providing a passageway for egress and ingress of air during the change in volume. The orifice meters air so that the resiliency of the snubber is greater for low frequency excursions than for high frequency excursions to thereby function as a damper for low frequency excursions and as a gas spring for high frequency excursions. In such a rotating apparatus, as taught by Wilson-Lee, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the dampening features taught by Savkar to minimize excursions in the apparatus, preserve the life of the apparatus, and arguably decrease noise of the apparatus during operation.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson and Lee as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rhodes (US Patent No. 6,115,541).

Wilson and Lee fail to statelý disclose a means for rotating said receptacle by a gear motor and pulley. Wilson teaches a motor means, however fails to specify the type of motor used in said invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use such a gear motor and pulley in said cleaning apparatus, as taught by Rhodes herein. Rhodes discloses a gear motor 500 mounted within the apparatus attached to a belt 502 which connects the gear motor to a pulley 504 mounted on a horizontal shaft (col. 13, lines 37-40). Rhodes teaches this apparatus provides efficient, inexpensive parts washer which is easy to manufacture, operate, and maintain (col. 1, lines 33-34); thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use such a gear motor-pulley assembly to achieve said benefits in operating a motor within a cleaning apparatus.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the


Art Unit: 1746

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rita R. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-8701. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Rita R. Patel



MICHAEL BARR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER